## REMARKS

Claims 1 and 5 were rejected under §112, second paragraph. The original claims have been replaced with new claims that are proper as to form. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2 and 4-7 were rejected as anticipated by JP 2000-279728 and claims 1, 3 and 5-6 were rejected as anticipated by MAYER 4,659,348. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Among other features, the new claims provide that the first filter region has a different surface density of passages than the second filter region (this feature was in claim 3).

MAYER does not disclose a first filter region with a different surface density of the passages than a second filter region. MAYER discloses a filtering body with an outer filter region 3 and a central filter region 4, 4a, where the central filter region 4, 4a has a greater porosity and smaller mass than the outer filter region (abstract and column 3, lines 9-31). MAYER does not state that the surface density of the passages is greater in one filter region than the other. No difference in surface density may be inferred from the different porosities and mass and, indeed, the surface densities of the two regions may be same. The smaller mass may result from the greater porosity or from a smaller thickness of the walls.

The drawings do not show passages and thus a density of the passages cannot be derived from the drawings. MAYER states that the different shading in the drawings is intended to indicate the different porosities (column 3, lines 9-13). There is no indication that the hachuring represents passages. In fact, interpreting the hachuring to represent passages would result in an inoperative device. The hachuring of the first and second regions does not match and thus the pressure drop would be disastrous. One of skill in the art would not learn from MAYER that the regions have different surface densities of the passages.

MAYER also does not disclose the adjacent, alternately closed passages of claims 8-17. The filtering body in MAYER is manufactured according to the cell or foamed material principle (column 4, lines 12-13). A foamed material does not have adjacent, alternately closed passages with walls through which the gas is filtered.

Further, and with regard to claims 10-12 and 18-19, the filter in MAYER is designed so that the inlet flow is directed towards the central part of the filter. By contrast, the gas filtering surface area of the peripheral area in these claims is greater than that of the central area so that a greater portion of the flow will go through the periphery (see page 5, lines 7-14 for an explanation of this feature). Accordingly, MAYER does not disclose the filtering regions of these claims.

In view of the present amendment and the foregoing remarks, it is believed that the present application has been placed in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

Thomas W Perkins

Thomas W. Perkins, Reg. No. 33,027
745 South 23rd Street
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

TWP/lk